

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections contained in the Office Action of April 3, 2009 is respectfully requested.

By this Amendment, claims 1, 2 and 5-7 have been amended, and claim 4 has been cancelled. Thus, claims 1-3 and 5-8 are currently pending in the application. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

The entire specification and abstract have been reviewed and revised. Due to the number of revisions, the amendments to the specification and abstract have been incorporated into the attached substitute specification and abstract. For the Examiner's benefit, a marked-up copy of the specification and abstract indicating the changes made thereto is also enclosed. No new matter has been added by the revisions. Entry of the substitute specification is thus respectfully requested.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the abstract of the disclosure due to informalities, as identified by the Examiner in items 5 and 6 of the Office Action. In this regard, it is noted that the abstract has been amended so as to correct the informalities identified by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's objections are not applicable to the amended abstract.

On pages 4-5 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification due to informalities, as identified by the Examiner in items 7-10 of the Office Action. In particular, in item 7, the Examiner indicated that the section headings should be revised in view of the guidelines provided by the Examiner on pages 3-4 of the Office Action. In this regard, it is noted that the attached substitute specification includes the relevant section headings identified in the guidelines provided by the Examiner.

In item 8, the Examiner identified several instances of apparent typographical errors and awkward phrasing in the specification, as listed on pages 4-5 of the Office Action. It is noted that all of the identified informalities have been corrected in the attached substitute specification, with one exception. In particular, in item 8, lines 1-2 of the Office Action, the Examiner identifies the term "sumps" on page 2, line 11 of the specification, but does not identify any error or correction regarding the term "sumps." In this regard, it is respectfully submitted that the term "sumps" is used properly in the specification, and that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the meaning of the term "sumps."

In item 9, the Examiner indicated that the reference numbers in the specification do not consistently appear with their respective text. In this regard, it is noted that the specification has been revised such that reference numbers are paired consistently with their respective text, as indicated in the attached substitute specification.

In item 10, the Examiner identified two paragraphs of the specification which refer to specific drawings, but which include reference numbers not shown in the specifically cited drawings. In this regard, it is noted that the paragraphs identified by the Examiner have been revised such that the reference numbers contained in those paragraphs are shown in the drawings specifically referred to in those paragraphs.

Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's objections are not applicable to the substitute specification.

On page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings due to inconsistencies in the specification regarding several reference numbers and their corresponding features. In this regard, it is noted that the specification has been revised such that all reference numbers are used consistently throughout the specification, as shown in the attached substitute specification. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's objection to the drawings on page 6 of the Office Action is not applicable in view of the revisions made in the substitute specification.

On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings for failing to include reference character 24 as identified on page 13 of the original specification. In this regard, it is noted that reference character 24 has been deleted in the attached substitute specification. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the drawings show all the reference characters identified in the specification.

On pages 7-8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. It is first noted that while the Examiner indicated that claims 1-5 are indefinite, the Examiner only provided comments regarding why claims 2, 4 and 5 are indefinite. Therefore, it is presumed that claims 1 and 3 are in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

In particular, the Examiner asserted that the phrase "an angle made between a cross-section of the side mark and the thickness direction" is unclear as to the direction in which the cross-section is taken. In this regard, it is noted that claim 2 has been amended to recite that the

angle between the cross-section and the thickness direction is 0 to 60° “toward an inner side of the molded resin body,” as is shown, for example, in Figs. 2, 5, 13 and 14. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would understand the orientation of the cross-section as recited in amended claim 2.

With regard to the § 112 rejection of claim 4, it is noted that claim 4 has been cancelled. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner’s § 112 rejection regarding claim 4 is rendered moot.

With regard to claim 5, the Examiner indicated that several portions of claim 5 are generally vague and unclear. In this regard, it is noted that claim 5 has been amended to recite that in a cross section as viewed in a plane which is parallel to the thickness direction perpendicular to the side face of the molded resin body, the coating layer covers the edge part of the top surface of the molded resin body such that an angle between (i) a virtual line connecting a bottom end part of the side face to an end part of the coating layer which is farthest inward from the side face and (ii) the thickness direction of the molded resin body is 45° or more, in order for the side gate mark not to be seen from the top surface of the molded resin body. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the structural recitations are clearly recited in amended claim 5, and it is therefore respectfully submitted that the Examiner’s rejection under § 112 is not applicable to amended claim 5.

On pages 9-11 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3 and 5-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yuhara et al. (US 2004/0173940) in view of Kashino (US 2003/0183495). On pages 11-13 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yuhara in view of Kashino, and further in view of Isao (JP 2001-277288) and Miyajima (US 5,824,252). For the reasons discussed below, it is respectfully submitted that the amended claims are clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

Amended independent claim 1 recites an in-mold decorated molded article, comprising a transparent molded resin body which is flattened in a thickness direction of the molded resin body and includes at least a side face on which a side gate mark is formed. The molded article of claim 1 further comprises a coating layer which is formed on a top surface of the transparent molded resin body, for covering an edge part of the top surface adjacent to the side face of the

molded resin body with the side gate mark formed, in order for the side gate mark not to be seen from the top surface of the molded resin body, and *a decorative layer which is formed on an entire bottom surface of the molded resin body, and which has a larger area than the coating layer.*

Yuhara discloses a double-face in-mold forming method in which a molded product 71 has UV hard layers 10 and 17 on top and bottom surfaces of the molded product, as shown in Fig. 25(d). However, as noted by the Examiner on page 10 of the Office Action, Yuhara does not disclose *a decorative layer which has a larger area than the coating layer*, as required by independent claim 1. Further, Yuhara does not disclose a decorative layer is formed on *an entire bottom surface* of the molded resin body, as also required by independent claim 1.

In this regard, the Examiner cites Kashino as disclosing a molded resin in which a decorative layer has a larger surface area than a coating layer. In particular, on page 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Fig. 2 of Kashino discloses a resin film 14 and a graphical symbol layer 13 which correspond to the “decorative layer” of claim 1 of the present application, and a decorating layer 19 which corresponds to the “coating layer” of claim 1. Further, the Examiner notes that the resin film 14 and graphical symbol layer 13 have a larger surface area than the decorating layer 19.

However, it is noted that the resin film 14 and graphical symbol layer 13 of Kashino are not formed on an entire bottom surface of the molded resin body, as required by independent claim 1, because paragraph [0024] of Kashino discloses that the resin film 14 and the graphical symbol layer 13 are adhered to the surface of the key top body 12 except the rear surface 12a (*i.e.*, the bottom surface as shown in Figs. 2-3). Therefore, because Kashino specifically discloses that the resin film 14 and the graphical symbol layer 13 are not formed on the bottom surface, the resin film 14 and the graphical symbol layer 13 do not correspond to a decorative layer formed on an entire bottom surface of the molded resin body, as required by independent claim 1.

Further, while Kashino discloses that the decorating layer 19 is formed on the rear surface 12a of the key top body 12, the decorating layer 19 of Kashino clearly does not correspond to *a decorative layer which has a larger area than the coating layer*, as required by independent claim 1.

Therefore, as none of the Yuhara and Kashino references discloses a decorative layer which is formed on an entire bottom surface of the molded resin body, and which has a larger area than the coating layer, as required by independent claim 1, the combination of the Yuhara and Kashino references does not disclose or suggest a decorative layer which is formed on an entire bottom surface of the molded resin body, and which has a larger area than the coating layer.

Therefore, for the reasons presented above, it is believed apparent that the present invention as recited in independent claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the Yuhara reference and the Kashino reference taken either individually or in combination. Accordingly, a person having ordinary skill in the art would clearly not have modified the Yuhara reference in view of the Kashino reference in such a manner as to result in or otherwise render obvious the present invention of independent claim 1.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1, as well as claims 2, 3 and 5-6 which depend therefrom, are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is clearly in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Koji HAMANO et al.

/Walter C. Pledger/

By 2009.10.05 23:42:00 -04'00'

Walter C. Pledger
Registration No. 55,540
Attorney for Applicants

WCP
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
October 5, 2009